

R E M A R K S

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner for his courtesy in granting the interview held on January 19, 2006 at which time the cited art was discussed, in relation to a proposed claim, similar to claim 1 herein, which adds subject matter and sub-paragraphs g) and h), which are re-stated as follows:

g) said means including dual rotary members one of which exerts tensioning force on said secondary line said primary lines and said operative connection remaining everywhere spaced from said dual rotary members,

h) said means including a spring coupled to said dual rotary members acting to urge said one of said rotary members in a direction for winding said secondary line on said one rotary member said secondary line being the only tensioning force exerting line wound on said one rotary member.


Base claims 20, 23, 40 and 47 have been similarly amended. Withdrawal of the final rejection based on the Gertzon and Kuhar references is respectfully solicited, for the following reasons:

- 1) At the interview, it was Counsel's

understanding that Examiner took the position that Gertzon's structure, indicated below, was a connection connecting two lines or cords to one line or cord. However, Gertzon does not label that structure, and he clearly teaches that his two cords 33 seen in Fig. 3 extend past that connection, and upwardly to double wheels 35 receiving the two cords 33. (See his column 2, lines 8-10.) Also, his guides 36 are disclosed as preventing the two cords 33 from twisting (col. 2, lines 9 and 10), and those guides extend close to box 10; and at column 1, lines 15, 16, 30 and 31, Gertzon teaches that two cords (seen at 33 in Fig. 3) are received into his support box 10 and that his rollers in his support box "receive the two cords" (col. 1, lines 15 and 16). Therefore, Gertzon does not suggest g) or h) of claim 1.

In summary, Gertzon teaches feeding of two shade lines or cords 33 into a box containing locking pulleys; Kuhar also teaches feeding two shade lines 52 into his box to a drum which winds both lines, so that the teaching in each case is to feed the two shade lines into pulley or drum processing mechanism, and not to feed a single secondary line (having 2 to 1

connection to two shade lines) to a rotary winding member. Neither reference suggests modification of the other to achieve this.



2) Kuhar does not disclose any 2 to 1 connections between cords, and in fact he teaches away from that, since he requires that his two blind lifting cords 52 extend in opposite directions away from his winding spool 30. Therefore Kuhar does not suggest h) of claim 1, no cited art suggesting h) of claim 1.

3) Accordingly, neither Gertzon nor Kuhar teaches or suggests f), g) and h) of claim 1, which should be allowable. Neither reference suggests how to

Serial No. 10/743,178

combine both references in a way to meet the totality of claim 1 herein.

The Interview Summary dated January 18, 2006 has been discussed with Examiner, and it appears not to apply to the art rejection of all claims 1, 2, 4-23, 25, 27, 28, 30-37 and 40-49.

Suitable '112 corrections have been made in the claims.

Allowance is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,


William W. Haefliger
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 17,120
(323) 684-2707

WWH:ts
Docket 12,569